REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-42 are pending in the present application.

Claims 12, 15-19 and 23 have been allowed. Claims 8-11, 13, 14,
26, 27, 29, 30, 32 and 39 were indicated in the March 4, 2003

Office Action as being allowable if rewritten in independent

form including the limitations of their base claim and any
intervening claims. Claim 7 was cancelled in a previous

amendment, and its subject matter was incorporated into amended

claim 1.

Claims 8, 10, 13 and 20 have been amended, as suggested in the March 4, 2003 Office Action, to change their dependencies from claim 7 (previously cancelled) to claim 1, thereby overcoming the objection set forth on page 3 of the Office Action as to those claims.

Claims 1, 20-22, 34, 41 and 42 were rejected in the March 4, 2003 Office Action as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. \$102(e) by Krumpelt et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,110,861. Krumpelt discloses a two-component catalyst that is employed in a reactor to effect partial oxidation. Krumpelt nowhere discloses or suggests the use of such catalysts in a fuel cell, nor does Krumpelt disclose or suggest the use of such catalysts in an electrode of a fuel cell, as the Office Action implies.

Krumpelt's catalyst is employed in reactors that process fuel before it is introduced into a fuel cell, such as those employed in fuel cell powered vehicles (see, for example, Kumar et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,248,566). Absent any disclosure or suggestion of fuel cell catalysts or, in particular, catalysts employed in fuel cell electrodes, Krumpelt cannot anticipate any of the applicants' claims.

Claims 2-6 were rejected in the March 4, 2003 Office Action for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. \$103 in view of the combination of Krumpelt with Narayanan et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,945,231.

Narayanan discloses platinum catalysts employable in acid or solid polymer electrolyte fuel cells. Applicants submit that, even if Narayanan's teachings were combined with Krumpelt's, that combination could not render obvious the applicants' claims because Krumpelt, whose teachings are limited to catalyst for fuel processing reactors, contains no disclosure or suggestion of catalysts for use in fuel cell themselves or, more importantly, for use in the electrodes of fuel cells.

Claims 24, 25, 28, 31, 33, 35-38 and 40 were rejected in the March 4, 2003 Office Action for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. \$103 in view of the combination of Krumpelt with Wilkinson et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,672,439. Wilkinson discloses first and

second catalysts supported on the same carbon support. As with the combination of Krumpelt with Narayanan discusses, applicants submit that, even if Wilkinson's teachings were combined with Krumpelt's, that combination could not render obvious the applicants' claims because Krumpelt, whose teachings are limited to catalyst for fuel processing reactors, contains no disclosure or suggestion of catalysts for use in fuel cell themselves or, more importantly, for use in the electrodes of fuel cells.

* * * * *

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-6, 20-22, 24, 25, 28, 31, 33-38 and 40-42 are allowable, in addition to claims 12, 15-19 and 23 already allowed and claims 8-11, 13, 14, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32 and 39 already indicated as being allowable. The Examiner is invited to telephone the applicants' undersigned attorney at (312) 775-8202 if any unresolved matters remain.

A Petition for Two-Month Extension of Time accompanies this submission, as well as a check for \$410.00 to cover the requisite fee for extension within the second month. Please charge any additional fees, and credit any overpayment, incurred

in connection with this submission to Deposit Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert W. Fieseler Registration No. 31,826

Attorney for Applicants

Michael B. Harlin Registration No. 43,658 McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor Chicago, Illinois 60661

Telephone (312) 775-8000 Facsimile (312) 775-8100

Dated: August 4, 2003

there'y raility that this correspondence is being the correspondence is being the correspondence is being the correspondence in the correspondence is being the correspondence in the correspondence is being the correspondence in the correspondence is being the correspondence in the correspondence is being the correspondence in the correspondence in the correspondence is being the correspondence in the correspondence in the correspondence is being the correspondence in the

RODERT W. FIESELER
Name of applicant, assigne, or
Registered Representative

8-4-0

Date of Signature